

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-5 and 7-26 are currently pending in this application. Claim 27 has been newly added by this reply. Claims 1, 7, 15, and 24 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 7, 15, and 24.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1, 7, 15, and 24 have been amended to recite that the unique authentication parameters are used to authenticate each of the plurality of wireless clients. Further, newly added dependent claim 27 recites that the plurality of authentication modules used to authenticate a wireless client or a class of wireless clients are selected based on a URL that is sent from the client to the wireless server. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, on pages 14 and 16 of the Specification. Applicant asserts that no new subject matter is added by way of these amendments.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 15-18, and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,219,790 ("Lloyd"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention is directed toward a system and method for a wireless client aware authentication scheme in a wireless network environment. Specifically, embodiments

of the claimed invention vary the degree of authentication modules required for authentication based on identified client detection information (*see* Specification, page 7, lines 13-18 and page 8, lines 10-14). More specifically, each client of the present invention belongs to a class of wireless clients, where each class of wireless clients is associated with *unique, class-specific authentication parameters*. Rather than traditional authentication parameters, such as a username and a password, the present invention uses specific client-type authentication parameters to authenticate each of the wireless clients. The unique authentication parameters include the client's browser type, operating system, version of the browser, client's bandwidth, etc. (*see* Specification, page 14). Thus, for example, the present invention uses a particular wireless client's browser type to authenticate that wireless client.

Turning to the rejection of the claims, for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. The Applicant respectfully asserts that Lloyd does not teach or suggest using unique, class-specific authentication parameters to authenticate each client of a class of wireless clients.

Specifically, Lloyd discloses an authorization and accounting (AAA) server (118) configured to secure access to the computer network against unauthorized access (*see* Lloyd, col. 5, ll. 17-18). Figure 2 of Lloyd shows an AAA server configured to communicate with several clients. The AAA server disclosed in Lloyd provides services for UNIX clients, Microsoft N/T clients, and NAS clients (*see* Lloyd, Figure 2). Further, Lloyd discloses that the AAA server supports multiple authentication transport protocols, that are associated with authentication transport protocol support modules (*see* Lloyd, col. 6, ll. 49-53). The authentication protocol support modules discussed in Lloyd include a Kerberos module, a

Remote Authentication Dial in User Service (RADIUS) module, a Microsoft Domain module, and a network information system (NIS) module (*see* Lloyd, Figure 2).

Lloyd fails to specifically disclose or suggest using unique authentication parameters, such as the wireless client's browser type, operating system, etc., to authenticate each client in a class of wireless clients. The cited portion of Lloyd only discloses that a variety of authentication *transport protocols* may be supported and used by a security server (*see* Lloyd, col. 2 ll. 1-28 and col. 6, ll. 41-48). However, the authentication protocol supported by a server is distinct from the authentication *parameters* requested from a client and used to authenticate the client. In fact, Lloyd clearly discloses that each client is authenticated using traditional authentication parameters (*i.e.*, by prompting the client for a username and password which are subsequently used to authenticate the client) (*see* Lloyd, col. 5, ll. 46). Lloyd is completely silent with respect to using unique, class-specific authentication parameters such as a browser type, operating system, bandwidth, etc., to *authenticate* each of a plurality of classes of wireless clients.

In view of the above, it is clear that Lloyd fails to disclose each and every limitation of the amended independent claims. Thus, amended independent claims 1, 7, 15, and 24 are patentable over Lloyd. Dependent claims 2-5, 8, 16-18, and 25-26 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9-12 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,663 ("Liao"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Lloyd fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of the amended independent claims. Further, Liao fails to supply that which Lloyd lacks. Liao discloses a credential caching proxy server that handles credential caching for a set of wireless client devices (*see* Liao, Abstract). Liao fails to disclose or suggest using unique authentication parameters, such as browser type, operating system, bandwidth, etc., to authenticate each wireless client that belongs to a particular class of wireless clients.

In view of the above, it is clear that the amended independent claims are patentable over Lloyd and Liao, whether considered separately or in combination. Further, dependent claims 9-12 and 19-23 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of his rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd in view of “iPlanet Portal Server Administrator Guide” (“iPlanet”) and further in view of “Chips aim to make passwords obsolete” Bloomberg News (“Bloomberg”). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Lloyd fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of the amended independent claims. Further, iPlanet fails to supply that which Lloyd lacks, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on iPlanet solely for the purpose of disclosing a membership module, a safeword module, a S/key module, and an LDAP authentication module (*see* Office Action mailed January 5, 2006, pages 13-14). Further, the Examiner relies on Bloomberg solely for the purpose of disclosing a nopassword module (*see* Office Action mailed January 5, 2006, page 13).

In view of the above, it is clear that the amended independent claims are patentable over Lloyd, iPlanet, and Bloomberg, whether considered separately or in combination.

Further, dependent claims 13 and 14 are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, withdrawal of his rejection is respectfully requested.

Newly Added Claim


Newly added dependent claim 27, which depends from independent claim 1, is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, favorable consideration of claim 27 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/538001).

Dated: April 5, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

Attorney Docket No.: 03226/538001; P6088

Certificate of Express Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.10

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail, Airbill No. EV842274594US, in an envelope addressed to:

MS RCE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on April 5, 2006
Date

32615

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Delra V. Wieser
Signature

Debra V. Wieser

Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

Registration Number, if applicable

(713) 228-8600
Telephone Number

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

Request for Continued Examination Transmittal (1 page)
 Fee Transmittal (1 page)
 Payment by credit card; Form PTO-2038 attached (1 page);
 charge \$790.00 to credit card
 Submission For A Request For Continued Examination Under 37 C.F.R.
 § 1.114 (11 pages)
 Return Receipt Postcard (1 page)